



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,243	02/06/2002	Bryan Spiess	A490-003	8499

7590

12/05/2003

N. Paul Friederichs  
Angenehm Law Firm, Ltd.  
P.O. Box 48755  
Coon Rapids, MN 55448-0755

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2003

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notification of Non-Compliance  
With 37 CFR 1.192(c)**

Application No.

10/068,243

Applicant(s)

SPIESS, BRYAN

Examiner

Marc Jimenez

Art Unit

3726

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 17 November 2003 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. ☐ The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. ☐ The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. ☐ At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
- ✓ 4. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)). ✓
- ✓ 5. ☒ The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)). ✓
6. ☒ A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
  - (a) ☒ the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
  - (b) ☐ the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
- ✓ 7. ☒ The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. ☐ The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
- ✓ 9. ☒ Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

✓ - There is no heading stating the status of amendments after final. There should be a separate heading reading "Status of Amendments After Final" with a statement to the effect of "There were no Amendments After Final Filed" under this heading.

✓ - No reference to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing by reference characters explaining the claimed invention is contained in the brief.

✓ - The issues written in paragraph (6) of the brief is not a concise statement of the issues presented for review. The issues on appeal are for example: Issue 1) whether the claim 6 is rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, Issue 2) whether claims 7, 10, and 13 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Thompson et al., Issue 3) whether claims 1-6, 8, and 9 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Thompson et al. in view of Rowles, Issue 4) whether claims 11 and 12 are rejectable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Thompson et al.

PETERVO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700